



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

we have nine stereotyped, several others ready for publication, and some score of topics on each of which, a new tract ought to be issued forthwith; and *popular volumes*, of which some are already stereotyped, one is now on hand, and others still are much needed for the diffusion of peace principles through the mass of the people.

APPROPRIATION OF FUNDS GIVEN.—Our friends, in sending their contributions, may either leave them at our disposal for such purposes as we may deem most indispensable, or may receive their value in the publications of our Society, to be distributed among the donors themselves. Individuals giving one dollar or more, may, if the name is sent, have our periodical for a year; and, where a congregation takes up a collection, it may, if they so request, be returned in tracts, or other publications, to be circulated in every family. This we regard as a very good method of promoting the cause, and should be glad at any time to receive donations in this way.

---

#### MR. WEBSTER'S SPEECH IN FANEUIL HALL.

With the bearings of this speech on party politics, we have nothing to do; but some of its incidental admissions, we cannot fail to notice, as undesigned yet decisive testimony to the cause of peace.

1. THE LATE DANGERS OF WAR.—Mark Mr. Webster's allusion to the frequent *probabilities of a war with England*. Our own hopes always prevailed over our fears; but we often felt serious apprehensions for the result, and thought the danger called for special efforts from the friends of peace. For this purpose, we offered for insertion in some twenty or thirty religious papers, a series of articles on the subject; but some of the editors excluded them from their columns, and denounced them as superfluous, on the ground that there was no danger of war. True, some of our wisest politicians gave free utterance to *their* fears; but it was well nigh impossible to make many good men look at the dangers which threatened us. Nor will many of them even now believe or realize the full import of Mr. Webster's assertion, "although the *whole* of the danger was not developed, yet I saw that, when the state of affairs between England and America should become known, an outbreak was *sure* to be at hand." He then specifies one of the occasions which threatened such an outbreak, and proceeds to state at some length the grounds of his own apprehensions.

2. THE BEST METHOD OF PEACE.—We are glad to hear at length the testimony of a diplomatist to the *efficacy of frank, straight-forward*

*justice in the settlement of national difficulties.* Mr. Webster's course was, first to acknowledge our own mistakes, and then ask England to correct hers; and the result has proved the wisdom of such a policy. "I thought the crisis"—the case of McLeod—"might be averted by admitting in our diplomatic correspondence in relation to it, the acknowledged principles of public law, and demanding an apology for the transgression of that law by Great Britain—by putting ourselves right in the first place, and insisting that they should do right in the second place. While in England in 1839, I happened to have occasion to address a large assembly of English personages; and I stated then what I thought, and what I think now, that in any controversy between the United States and England, the only eminent advantage which either side will possess, will be in the rectitude of its cause. With right on our side, we should be a match for England;—with right on hers, she would be a match for us, or for any body."

This last assertion is true only on the supposition of a policy strictly pacific. In a controversy to be settled by truth and reason, law and equity, we should, with right on our side, be more than a match for England or the world; but in an appeal to the arbitrament of the sword, to the savage argument of bullets and bomb-shells, right has little, if any power to turn the scale. The combatants on neither side understand the real merits of the case; and victory, right or wrong, will perch on the banners of superior numbers, skill and other accidental advantages. The efficacy of right in deciding a battle, a duel, a quarrel! We might as well talk of right in a conflict between two bull-dogs or tigers. Appeal to any real criterion of right; and right must, in all and every case, gain its cause. And it is in part for this very reason, that we would transfer national controversies from force to reason, from lead and steel to facts and arguments; from the warrior to the negotiator; from the arena of professional cut-throats to a tribunal of able, upright, disinterested judges, bound by their honor and their oath to decide for the right.

3. PUBLIC OPINION A PREVENTIVE OF WAR.—We rejoice to quote Mr. Webster's clear and bold avowal of *the influence exerted by public opinion in preventing war*. "With the advancement of society, and the improvement and diffusion of the means of education, a new and elevated tribunal has come into being, to which the disputes of nations must in all cases be referred—I mean that of public opinion. Nations cannot now go to war, unless for grounds and reasons which will justify them in the general judgment of mankind. The influence of civilization, the increase of knowledge, the extension of commerce, and more than all, that heavenly light which beams over Christendom, restrain nations from gratifying an inordinate ambition, by the bloody scenes of war. It has been truly said, that every peace arrangement is a tribute to Christianity, and a new proof of the benign influences of the Christian faith."

These are noble, cheering admissions; but whence arose this power of public opinion for the preservation of peace? From education, and knowledge, and civilization, and social advancement, and commerce, and Christianity? True; but all these were in existence and operation ages ago; and why did they not prevent the centuries of blood that have since rolled over Christendom itself? How came all these causes

to fail of producing peace until 1815, the time when the friends of peace in both hemispheres began their joint efforts? Why have causes, once so powerless for the peace of Christendom, now become so effectual? Strange that such a man should overlook, or refuse to acknowledge, the source of this auspicious change, found, under God, mainly in the efforts and influences which together constitute the cause of peace. We might, with equal fairness, specify the same causes to account for the temperance reform, without an allusion to what the friends of temperance have done to combine those causes in the formation of a public sentiment, effective for the prevention of intemperance. Nay, we appeal to Mr. Webster's own experience. There was, for aught we know, as much of education, and knowledge, and civilization, and Christianity, when he himself made, in the Senate Chamber at Washington, his fierce war-speech, as when he subsequently took back that speech, and set himself at work with so much zeal and success to adjust the difficulties of England and America without bloodshed. What made him change his tone and course? Not alone the general influences to which he alludes, but those influences combined in a popular demand for the very policy he has pursued; and that demand, we verily believe, was mainly the result of efforts in the cause of peace.

In the same light do we regard the remarks of Mr. Webster about the influence of civilization, and knowledge, and commerce, and Christianity, in restraining nations from war, and forming in public opinion a more elevated tribunal than the sword, for the settlement of their disputes. These results are highly auspicious in all their bearings on the welfare of the world; but they have come, under God, from the friends of peace wielding those influences to produce these results. This position no man of candor and competent information will deny.

Mr. Webster speaks of public opinion as having erected "a new and elevated tribunal to which the disputes of nations *must* in *all* cases be referred." Here is the substance of all that the friends of peace have proposed in a Congress of Nations for the peaceful adjustment of whatever difficulties may arise between them. This single clause contains the nucleus, and even an outline of our whole plan.—But, if nations *must* even now refer their disputes to such a tribunal, why not proceed without delay to establish it in due form, and invest it with acknowledged power for its work of peace? Why not recognize and adopt it as a substitute for war in all cases, and let it actually supersede the whole war-system? On this supposition, where is the necessity or the use of preparations for bloodshed, pillage and devastation?

Our diplomatist truly says, "that every peace arrangement is a tribute to Christianity, and a new proof of its benign influences;" but with still more truth might he have represented every such arrangement as a tribute to the cause of peace; as a new proof of its claims on all the friends of God or man, and as a presage of more uninterrupted and lasting peace, through Christendom.

4. INFLUENCE OF APPREHENDED WAR ON BUSINESS AND PROPERTY.—Some of our readers may be startled at Mr. Webster's allusion to the influence of the bare rumor of war in destroying property by a reduction of its value. "I did not," he says, "think it necessary to

state the fact *then*; but, if every thing had been known here, that we knew in Washington, the shipping interest, and every thing which depends on commerce, would have been depressed one half in six hours." And at that very time did some of the sentinels on the watch-towers of the public mind denounce *us* as alarmists and incendiaries for our efforts to forestall popular opinion against the war which our rulers so much feared, so seriously expected!—But mark the influence of the war-policy on the business of nations. The shipping interest, and all kinds of business dependent on commerce, must embrace through the whole land an amount of property exceedingly large, hundreds of millions; yet half of it all, Mr. Webster tells his hearers, and every business man in the audience assented to its truth, would have been sacrificed for the time, simply by telling the people what our rulers knew about the danger of war. Will none of the thousands now rich, who would have been ruined by war, give to the cause of peace a generous fraction of what that cause has saved them?

5. THE MORALITY OF WAR.—We cannot refrain from quoting still further an illustration of *the morality of war*. "I allude," says Mr. Webster, "to occurrences on the frontier in 1841. A year or two before, the British Government had seen fit to authorize a military incursion into our territory against the steamer *Caroline*, alleged to be engaged in hostilities against her provincial subjects. The act was avowed by England as a public act. Now, suppose any citizen of the United States, who, as a military man, should obey an order which he *must* obey or be hanged, should be found years after in a foreign country, tried for an ignominious crime, and threatened with an ignominious punishment, is there a man in the whole country who would not instantly cry out for redress and vengeance? Every elevated government claims for its subjects personal immunity when acting in obedience to its commands."

Look at this doctrine of war. 'Military orders, no matter what they are, the soldier *must* obey or be hanged.' If commanded to rob and burn houses, and butcher unresisting men, women and children, he must do these deeds of fire and blood, or be hanged! Such deeds every community, whether Christian or pagan, civilized or savage, regards as crimes fit for the prison or the gallows; but, when the perpetrator is arraigned like any other culprit for trial by due course of law, his government interferes, and claims exemption from the penalty due to such crimes. Should he be punished, "is there," asks Mr. Webster, "a man in the whole country who would not instantly cry out for redress and vengeance?" Strange morality! the morality of pirates and bandits leagued for the support of each other in deeds of robbery and blood! Yet this is the acknowledged, the avowed morality of war. And what must be the effect of such doctrines on the morals of a community? The burglar, the incendiary, the assassin for whose punishment on the gallows public opinion in one country is fiercely clamorous, may be in another regarded as a hero, a worthy patriot, a candidate for the highest honors his government can bestow! In New York McLeod is a villain, in England a favorite; and the very deed that gave the neck of Andre to the halter here, inscribed his name on the walls of Westminster Abbey! Such is war, a custom still retained by nations pluming themselves on their intelligence, their morality, and their piety.